

Mobility Options Action Team

Meeting Notes

April 20, 2004

Attendance

Bud Beebe, Sharen Blowers, Cheri Brown, Garry Bulluck, Gregory Dahlin, Joe DeKoning, Sharon Edgar, John Egelhaaf, Jaye Elowsky, Susanne Fredericks, Daniel Furton, Kip Grimes, Snehamay Kaasnabis, Diane Kempen, Steven Leiby, Peter Lenz, Oliver Lindsay, Rick Lyles, Mike McGilton, Phil Reid, Hannah Remitemia, Erin Shelton, Sara Smith, Renee Uitto, John Waterman, Kevin Wisselink

Meeting Overview (25 words or less)

The team reviewed Issue #2, Perception of Poor Service. Sub-Team Chair Rick Lyles presented methodology for gather information and survey questions. Group discussion was held to gather further information needed for survey questions.

Meeting Notes

1. Kevin Wisselink asked that someone from the Mobility Options Team attend and share our progress at the May 11, 2004 Moderators meeting. Rick Lyles and Diane Kempen agreed to attend. Kevin will forward meeting location and time to Rick and Diane.
2. Diane Kempen shared the Developmental Disabilities Council Voucher Program with Team. Diane asked for names of potential providers to add to their RFP invitation list.

Action Items

The Mobility Options Team discussed Issue #2.

Issue #2: Perception of poor Service.

Goal: Improve the perception. Improve the reality/performance.

Action: Survey perceptions of users and non-users.

Provide education and incentives to people, business, and school systems to encourage utilizing mobility options.

The Team reviewed the methodology presented by the Sub-Committee for developing a survey. Attached is the draft. Discussions about the questions and methods of delivery were held. Who will be surveyed and who will be accountable for delivery will be further discussed. Final presentation will be held at the May 18, 2004 meeting.

Continued Timeline for task completion is as follows:

May presentation and finalizing actions of Issue #2.

June full team discussion and information gathering on Issue #1.

July full team discussion and information gathering on Issue #1.

August full team discussion and information gathering on Issue #3.

September presentation and finalizing actions of Issue #3.

Listed below are the Sub-Committees and members:

Gaps in Service:

Doug Anderson
Sharen Blowers
Garry Bulluck
Greg Dahlin
Diane Kempen
Peter Lenz
Eric Shelton

Perception of Poor Service:

John Englehaaf
Diane Kempen
Rick Lyles-Chair
Renee Uitto

Funding:

Doug Anderson
Sharen Blowers
Garry Bulluck
Joe DeKoning
Sharen Edgar-Chair
Daniel Fulton
Philip Kazmierski
John Waterman

**Proposed
Agenda Topics
For Next
Meeting**

1. Final presentation and discussion Issue #2.
2. Draft Agenda for Next Meeting.

**Next Meeting
Dates**

1. Tuesday, May 18, 2004
1:00-4:00pm
CATA Board Room, 4615 Tranter Avenue, Lansing MI 48910
2. Tuesday, June 15, 2004
1:00-4:00pm
CATA Board Room, 4615 Tranter Avenue, Lansing MI 48910

Issue #2: Perception of Poor Service

As part of the Mobility Options Action Team agenda, it was determined that the public's perception of poor service from local transit systems was an obstacle in providing mobility. Mobility can be defined as: "The ability to move from one place to another for purposes of meeting personal, social, employment, or recreational needs and desires." This document serves to help us define, evaluate, and improve both the quality of transit with respect to mobility. According to the TCQSM (Reference 1) quality of service is the overall measure **or** perceived performance of transit service from the passenger's point of view. The quality of service should also be evaluated from the non-users' and providers' perspectives. The dimensions of transit service evaluated here may (and should) overlap with those evaluated in Issues #1, and #3.

The measures of quality of service can be divided into five areas as defined below:

Availability: how easily potential passengers can use transit.

Service Delivery: day-to-day experiences with transit, is it comfortable and convenient?

Travel Time: amount of time a trip takes

Safety and Security: likelihood of accidents (safety) and/or crime (security) during a transit trip.

Maintenance: availability/condition of vehicles to provide transit service.

Each of these measures can be represented by specific dimensions of transit service. Some dimensions fit into more than one category. For example, wait time at a bus stop is part of availability (how often does the bus come) and total travel time (how much time will the rider spend standing around). Each dimension should be evaluated from four different directions: reality, user's perspective, non-user's perception, and provider's perception. The table below provides definitions, suggestions, and resources to be used in making this evaluation.

Table 1. Quality of Service Evaluation Framework

measures/dimensions of quality of service*	tentative definition	resources ⁺	assessment	standards	solutions
availability	average wait between arrivals at stops in the area	1.b, 4			
	areas currently served by system	1.b, 3.b, 4			
	areas currently not served by system	3.b			
	percentage of population served by system				
	hours of operation for transit system (will vary by route)	1.b, 2.b, 3.b, 4			
service delivery	accessibility (typical rider)	2.b			
	accessibility (elderly, disabled, poor)	distance to transit stop from origin			
	reliability	distance to transit stop from origin	3.b		
	comfort	% of arrivals on time	1.b, 3.b, 4		
	price	availability of seats, ease of boarding, shelter at stop	1.b, 3.b		
	transfers	price of travel by transit (can be compared with other modes)	1.b		
	destination access	number of transfers between origin & destination	1.b, 3.b	measured only for most desired trips?	
		time/distance to desired destination			

*columns are defined at the end of the table

+links to specific resources can be found at the end of the document

Table 1. Quality of Service Evaluation Framework cont'd.

measures/dimensions of quality of service*	tentative definition	Resources ⁺	assessment standards	solutions
travel time	total travel time amount of time from door to door	1.b, 4	measured only for most desired trips?	
	wait time amount of time waiting at stop	1.b		
	transfer time Amount of time waiting/walking to transfer	1.b, 3.b		
safety & security				
	accidents frequency of accidents involving a transit service vehicle	1.b		
	crime frequency of crimes on transit system and at stops	1.b		
maintenance				
	attractiveness of transit vehicle – dirt, graffiti, etc	1.b		
	vehicle performance/ service denials number of stops missed due to breakdown of vehicles (related to reliability & availability)	1.b		
	spare vehicles number of extra vehicles available to replace broken ones	1.b		

Column Definitions

- Measures/Dimensions of Quality of Service – a quantitative or qualitative factor used to evaluate a particular aspect of transit service.
- Tentative Definition - how the issue is defined for our purposes, e.g. reliability = % on-time service
- Resources - websites, journal articles, and publications relating to both the reality and perception of an issue as well as how to measure and fix these problems
- Assessment - methods for evaluating the measure of quality of service from all four points of view.
- Standards - industry, government, and/or "our" standards for this measure of the quality of service. How frequent *should* the stops be?
- Solutions - ways that the perception or reality of each issue can be changed for the better. Depending on the reality and perception of the issue, solutions may involve changing the service (more frequent stops) or changing the perception of the service (more readily available schedules).

References:

- 1.a. Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual (TCQSM)
http://www4.trb.org/trb/onlinepubs.nsf/web/tcrp_report_100
Published in 2003, this manual is similar to the highway capacity manual, except that it focuses on transit systems. The manual provides measures of capacity *and* quality of transit services. Definitions of many of our issues can be found here as well as some methods of measuring and evaluating them.
- 1.b. Part 3: Quality of Service
<http://trb.org/publications/tcrp/tcrp100/part%203.pdf>
- 2.a. Kamloops Official Transit Plan – Kamloops, BC, Canada
http://www.city.kamloops.bc.ca/transportation/plans/transitplan_frameset.html
Official Transit plan for the Kamloops area for the next twenty years with a focus on expansion in the next 3 years.
- 2.b. Section 2: Looking Back, 3.1 Service Targets
<http://www.city.kamloops.bc.ca/transportation/pdfs/transitplan/section2.pdf>
- 2.c. Section 2 Looking Back, 4.1 Passenger Surveys
<http://www.city.kamloops.bc.ca/transportation/pdfs/transitplan/section2-4.pdf>
- 3.a. Regional Passenger Transportation Plan – Environment Waikato, New Zealand
<http://www.ew.govt.nz/policyandplans/pip/pip2003/index.htm>
An evaluation of current system quality and description of what the community wants from their transit system in the future.
- 3.b. Appendix II: Service Level Guidelines
<http://www.ew.govt.nz/policyandplans/pip/pip2003/pip2003.6.htm>
- 3.c. Appendix XI: Survey of Public Perception of Passenger Transport
<http://www.ew.govt.nz/policyandplans/pip/pip2003/pip2003.14.htm>
4. Brevard Transit Quality of Service Evaluation
<http://www.brevardmpo.com/publications/pdf%20files/Transit%20QOS.pdf>
A simple quality of service assessment for Brevard County, FL based on the TCQSM (ref. 1).

References, con't:

5. Coordinated Transportation Bibliography List - Community Transportation Association Report
<http://www.ctaa.org/ntrc/coordination/docs/resources/coordinationbibliographylist.pdf>
Bibliography from a Transportation Coordination report.
6. Performance Evaluation for Rural Transit Systems -Community Transportation Association
<http://www.ctaa.org/ntrc/rtap/pubs/ta/perform.asp>
A report on how to perform a system performance evaluation for rural transit systems with lots of good references at the end.